

**Amendments to the Specifications:**

Please replace page 11, line 7 through 9 (Table) with the following amended Table:

<u>TIME</u>	<u>RATIO, %, SUBJECT TO ZIP</u>	<u>RATIO, %, SUBJECT TO CITY</u>	<u>RATIO, %, SUBJECT TO COUNTY</u>	<u>RATIO, %, ZIP TO CITY</u>	<u>RATIO, %, ZIP TO COUNTY</u>	<u>RATIO, %, CITY TO COUNTY</u>
1994	103	120	<del>127</del> <u>112</u>	117	109	94
1995				120	109	91
1996						90
1997						91
1998						85
1999	110	189	<del>127</del> <u>153</u>	172	139	81
2000	106	185	<del>139</del> <u>144</u>	175	136	78
2001	108	197	<del>141</del> <u>146</u>	182	135	74
2002	96	169	<del>125</del> <u>139</u>	176	145	82
2003	96	164	<del>127</del> <u>133</u>	170	138	81
2003*	98	166	<del>127</del> <u>133</u>	170	138	81
2003**	134	228	<del>152</del> <u>185</u>	170	138	81

\* proposed realistic value

\*\* proposed unrealistic value

Please replace page 11, lines 15 through 18 with the following amended paragraph:

It also is evident that the ratios computed from the unrealistic valuation (134%, 228%, ~~152%~~ 185%) stand out somewhat from the rest of the matrix. The unrealistic valuation is apparent when measured arithmetically by subtraction. For example, by way of subtraction, 134% is 24% higher than 110%, the

Please replace page 12, lines 1 through 3 with the following amended paragraph:

maximum ratio found in the column above it. Similarly, 228% is 31 % higher than 197%, the maximum ratio in the column above it, and 185% is 32% higher than 153%, ~~152% is 11% higher than 141%~~, the maximum ratio in the column above it.

Please replace page 12, lines 8 and 9 (Table) with the following amended Table:

Realistic	Unrealistic
98% / 110% = 89%	134% / 110% = 122%
166% / 197% = 84%	228% / 197% = 116%
<del>127% / 141% = 90%</del> 133% / 153% = 87%	<del>152% / 144% = 106%</del> 185% / 153% = 121%

Attachments: "Clean Specifications Sheet"